



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/988,431	12/11/97	GONG	L 3070-007

020277
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY
600 13TH STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3096

LM21/0522

EXAMINER

BADERMAN, S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2785

10

DATE MAILED: 05/22/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/988,431

Applicant(s)
Gong

Examiner
Scott T. Baderman

Group Art Unit
2785



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Scott T. Baderman

(3) _____

(2) Gene Molinelli

(4) _____

Date of Interview May 11, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 11, and 21

Identification of prior art discussed:
Fischer (5,311,591)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

It was agreed that the reference above does not teach or suggest "determining whether an action is authorized based on permissions associated with a plurality of routines in a calling hierarchy associated with a principal." The Examiner, after further consideration, also agreed that the interpretation that the request made by the program taught by the above reference is similar to the routines in a calling hierarchy taught in claims 1, 11 and 21 would not be proper. It was stated that no amendment needs to be made in order to overcome the above reference. However, Mr. Molinelli was reminded that an updated search must still be performed before passing this application to issue.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

 5/11/00

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.